UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,180	08/21/2003	Joseph Celi JR.	AUS920030375US1	7312

35525 7590 11/14/2008

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
TRAN, TUYETLIEN T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2179	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/14/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptonotifs@yeeiplaw.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/645,180	CELI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TUYETLIEN T. TRAN	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: the amendment filed on 08/22/08. **This action is made non-final**.

2. Claim 1 is pending in the case.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/22/08 has been entered.

Claim Objections

4. Applicant's amendment renders moot the previous objections; therefore, the previous objections are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tuli (Patent No US 6,941,382 B1; hereinafter Tuli_A) in view of Tuli (Pub. No. US 2001/0028470 A1; hereinafter Tuli_B) further in view of Robotham et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0015042 A1; hereinafter Robotham).

As to claim 1, Tuli_A teaches:

A method for displaying a web page on a display screen (e.g., see Fig. 1 and col. 1, lines 29-40) comprising:

accessing the web page through a proxy using a uniform resource locator by a user (e.g., the web page is accessed through a host computer 1 as shown in Fig. 1; wherein the host computer connects to the Internet and provide web page bit map images to the client device);

determining if the size of a web page is larger than a display screen (e.g., see col. 2 lines 34-38 and lines 54-63; note that in order for the host computer to divide the web page image into smaller portion that substantially or completely covers the displayable area of the palm device, the skilled artisan, having common knowledge and common sense, would realize that this determining step is included); and

responsive to a determination that the web page is larger than the display screen (e.g., see col. 2 lines 38-47 and lines 54-63), performing steps comprising:

creating a web page bitmap image from a first web page displayed on a browser (e.g., translating html images into raster images or color images, see col. 2 lines 23-32; note that raster images are also referred to as bit map images, see col. 4 lines 55-56);

dividing the web page bitmap image into a plurality of fragments including a first web page bitmap image fragment and a second web page bitmap image fragment (e.g., see Figs. 2, 3 and col. 2 lines 38-47); and

displaying the first web page bit map image fragment on the display screen (e.g., see Fig. 2);

Tuli_A does not expressly teach analyzing a HTML code for the first web page. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to include the feature of analyzing a HTML code for the first web page because Tuli_A suggests to the skilled artisan that the translator program can translates the image such that words that represents links on the page 5 are translated to be slightly bolder (e.g., see col. 3 lines 3-10; wherein the HTML code needs to be analyzed to identify hyperlinks contained within the web page image). One would have been motivated to implement this feature to provide the ability for the user to interact with the web image on small display device just like the way that one can be able to interact with a normal web page.

Although Tuli_A teaches that sections of a web page image are transmitted and displayed in the order of priority such that the priority fragment is transmitted and displayed first (e.g., see col. 2 lines 56-60), Tuli_A does not expressly teach that the proxy sends only one fragment to the hand held display device and that responsive to a request for another fragment, sending another fragment to the hand held display device.

Tuli_B, having the same inventive entity and same system structure, teaches only a portion of a web page image is sent from the host computer to the portable device to be displayed for view by a user (e.g., see [0021]). Tuli_B further teaches responsive to a request for another fragment, sending another fragment to the hand held display device (e.g., see [0022]). Tuli_B expressly discloses sending only the portion of the image that appears in the

browser window to the remote device reduces the bandwidth considerably, and conserves on memory in the portable device, compared to sending the entire web page to be stored on the device (e.g., see [0022]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the web display feature as taught by Tuli_A to include the feature of sending only one fragment to a hand held display device and sending another fragment to the hand held display device upon request as disclosed in Tuli_B. One would have been motivated to make such a combination is to reduce the bandwidth and conserve on memory in the portable device.

Tuli_A and Tuli_B do not teach the proxy creates a unique identifier for the web page bitmap image that identifies the user with the web page bitmap image and that includes a time, to a nanosecond, that the user requested the web page.

In the same field of endeavor of displaying a web page image on a small display device (e.g., [0014]), Robotham teaches similar structure (e.g., Figs. 1, 2) wherein a web page is accessed through a proxy (e.g., server 22) and wherein the proxy creates a unique identifier for a web page bitmap image that identifies a user with the web page bitmap image (e.g., [0087], [0088], [0195], [0301]; wherein the server 22 prioritizes which parts of the non-overview representations should be sent sooner, based on the history of user interactions) and that includes a time that the user requested the web page (e.g., [0216]-[0218]; wherein the client 24 transmits a timestamp for its cached selection region 124 when requesting a refresh). While Robotham teaches recording a time that the user requested the web page, Robotham does not teach include time, to a nanosecond. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to record time, to a nanosecond in the timestamp as taught by Robotham to more accurately document the time the user request the web page image.

According, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the web page display feature as taught by Tuli_A and Tuli_B to include the feature of keeping tracking of the time the user requests a web page image as taught by Robotham to achieve the claimed invention. One would have been motivated to make such a combination is to reduce bandwidth; thus, speed up the communication time.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/22/2008 have been considered but are moot in new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33,216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006,1009, 158 USPQ 275,277 (CCPA 1968)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00, off on alternating Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TuyetLien T Tran/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179